

328-15  
C68

BINDING COPY



S

# The College Board Review

## BOARD VOTES MAJOR CHANGES

### *In This Issue*

Board Votes Changes . . . . .	73
Vice-Chairman Elected . . . . .	73
Dr. Conrad, Editor, Resigns . . . . .	74
New Members Admitted . . . . .	74
New College Choice Rule . . . . .	75
Fees Raised . . . . .	75
Test Dates Set For 1950 . . . . .	76
Exam Program to Be Studied . . . . .	76
Fackenthal, Eurich Speak . . . . .	76
New Directions In Testing . . . . .	77
Dr. Fuess Honored . . . . .	79
How To Register . . . . .	80

### Bryn Mawr College President Elected Vice-Chairman

Katharine E. McBride, President of Bryn Mawr College and a trustee of the Educational Testing Service, will succeed Mildred McAfee Horton, President of Wellesley and former director of the Waves, as Vice Chairman of the Board as a result of an election held at the Board's October meeting.

Mrs. Horton, whose unexpired term Miss McBride will fill, resigned from Wellesley and the Board in order to be able to assist her husband, the Reverend Douglas Horton, in religious work.

### Candidates For January Exam Series Will Not Be Affected

Important changes in College Board procedures and fees, scheduled to take effect in April, were voted by the nearly two hundred college and secondary school representatives who attended the ninety-eighth regular meeting of the Board at New York's Hotel Biltmore on October 27th.

The representatives, including forty college presidents, took the following actions:

1. Revised the long-standing "college choice" rule.
2. Urged member colleges to notify applicants of their practices in using preference information.
3. Raised fees to meet rising costs.

The new college choice rule, which will permit candidates to name one, two, or three colleges as "equally preferred," or to rank them in preferential order, will go into effect with the April series of examinations, as will the new fees of \$6 for the morning programs, \$8 for the afternoon program, or \$12 for the complete series. This raise in fees of \$1 each for the morning and afternoon programs and \$2 for the one-day series will not apply to candidates for the January exami-

## THE COLLEGE BOARD REVIEW

News and Research of the  
College Entrance Examination Board

Published quarterly by the  
College Entrance Examination Board  
425 West 117th Street, New York 27, N. Y.

Director . . . . . Frank H. Bowles

Secretary . . . . . William C. Fels

### Major Changes (Continued)

nations. April, June, and August candidates will pay the new fees.

A special announcement explaining the new procedures has been mailed to all colleges and schools using Board examinations. New application blanks and a revised *Bulletin of Information* for the April 1949 series are in preparation.

Professor Edward S. Noyes of Yale, Chairman of the College Board, presided at the meeting, which was the first to be addressed by the new Director, Frank H. Bowles, formerly Columbia University's Director of Admissions. Mr. Bowles discussed the Board's role as an instrument for the solution of problems which confront secondary schools and colleges at the critical point where students transfer from one to the other.

The Board admitted fifteen colleges and one educational association to membership. New Articles of Association and By-laws considered by the April 1948 meeting of the Board were passed. A provision of the new Articles will open Board membership to colleges which use Board examinations and are accredited by their regional associations.

Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal, General Eisenhower's predecessor at Columbia, and Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, Acting President of Stanford, spoke at a luncheon which followed the meeting.

### Dr. Conrad, Editor, Resigns; Review To Add Fourth Issue

Dr. Herbert S. Conrad, distinguished psychologist and editor of the COLLEGE BOARD REVIEW since its inception in the spring of 1947, has resigned from the Educational Testing Service to accept a position as Chief of the Research and Statistical Service, Division of Central Services, of the United States Office of Education. Mr. Conrad's editorial duties have been assumed by the Secretary.

Beginning with this issue, the REVIEW will be published four times during the academic year. It will continue to report news and research of the College Board but will later add material on the use of Board examinations by colleges and schools.

### Board Adds Fifteen Colleges, One Association

The election of fifteen colleges and universities and one educational association to membership in the College Entrance Examination Board at the October meeting raises the Board's total membership to ninety-four institutions of higher education and fourteen associations.

The new member colleges are:

Beloit College	Grinnell College
Bennington College	Hood College
Bucknell University	Lafayette College
Catholic University of America	Occidental College
Clark University	St. Lawrence University
College of William and Mary	Skidmore College
George Washington University	University of Michigan
	University of Washington

The Council of New England Secondary School Principals Associations, which will be entitled to designate one representative, was also elected to membership.

# NEW COLLEGE CHOICE RULE

## *Exam Board Adopts Candidates' "Bill of Rights"*

Moved by appeals from students, parents, and heads of secondary schools, the College Board has revised its long-standing rule requiring final candidates for its examinations to express a first, second, and third choice among the colleges to which they wish their scores reported. Candidates for the April 9, 1949, examinations will be the first to come under the new rule.

The new procedure, recommended to the Board by a special committee headed by Dean Henry S. Dyer of Harvard, has as its basis a four point "Bill of Rights" adopted by the Board:

- (1) A candidate who has a preference for a given college should have an opportunity to express that preference.
- (2) Each college has a right to know which candidates genuinely prefer it.
- (3) A candidate who has no genuine preference should not be compelled to state one.
- (4) The College Entrance Examination Board, as a disinterested third party, is an appropriate medium for registering this preference information.

The Board will continue to report candidates' scores to one, two, or three colleges at no extra charge. The candidate will list the colleges on the examination application blank and circle preference numbers. The space on the blank will appear as follows:

*Name of Institution*

(Show order of preference by circling *one* number at the right of each institution listed.)

- (A) \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
(B) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 2  
(C) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 2 3

If the candidate desires reports to as many

as three colleges, he may circle three 1's, to indicate no preference; a 1 and two 2's, to indicate a clear first choice and two colleges equally preferred after it; two 1's and a 2, to indicate two colleges as equal first choices and a third college as a "second" choice, or 1, 2, 3 to show a distinct first, second, and third choice. Thus, the candidate will be able to indicate his college preference, if any, accurately. Colleges listed after the first three need not be listed in order of preference. Reports to these colleges will indicate only that the college is not among the candidate's first three choices. Each report after the first three will still entail an additional fee of fifty cents.

The Board also adopted a resolution urging the member colleges to state their practices in regard to the use of the designated preferences and to include these statements in the instructions sent to applicants by the colleges themselves.

The introduction of the new procedure will require a four-week rather than a three-week closing date for the receipt of April applications.

### *Fees Up In April*

Rising costs have forced the Board to raise its examination fees one dollar for a morning program, one dollar for an afternoon program, and two dollars for a complete series. The present fees of \$5, \$7, and \$10 will hold for the January 1949 series. In April 1949 and thereafter the fees will be \$6, \$8, and \$12. Late fees and incidental charges are not affected.

## Test Dates Set For 1950

Examination dates for the College Entrance Examination Board's 1950 testing year have been announced. Tests will be administered in the United States, its possessions, and in foreign countries on the following dates:

Saturday, January 14, 1950

Saturday, April 15, 1950

Saturday, June 3, 1950

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

## Examination Program Undergoing Study

A thorough restudy of the Board's program of examinations will be undertaken this year, Frank D. Ashburn, Chairman of the Board's Committee on Examinations, reported at the October meeting.

Principal aims of the study will be to seek a single satisfactory morning program, to draw a clear line between aptitude and achievement tests, and to set mathematics examinations satisfactory to boys' and girls' schools, men's and women's liberal arts colleges, and engineering schools.

The committee has chosen two of many alternative plans for circularization to schools, colleges, and associations in the near future.

The committee, Mr. Ashburn reported, had also gone on record to the effect that the Intermediate and Comprehensive Mathematics Tests are achievement tests. This was done at the request of teachers of mathematics, who felt that colleges were not including mathematics among their required achievement tests because mathematics tests are offered in the morning at the same time as the Scholastic Aptitude Test, while all other achievement tests are offered in the afternoon.

## Fackenthal, Eurich Address Board

Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal, General Eisenhower's predecessor at Columbia, and Acting President Alvin C. Eurich of Stanford addressed the Board at a luncheon following the semiannual meeting.

Dr. Fackenthal pointed to responsibility as the most important factor in leadership and raised the question of whether colleges were doing everything possible to develop responsible citizens. "Education must insure, as far as it can, that any leader raised by the people's confidence in him shall reward that confidence by using his influence in the best interest of the public welfare. Then, just as brilliance has been said to mark the French, level-headedness the British, independence the Swiss, so will responsibility come to mark the American."

The former President of Columbia recalled that in his first contact with the College Board in 1901 he had been amazed at its versatility. "The Board," he said, "found no difficulty in passing me in advanced Greek while leaving the door open that I might try a second time the elementary examination."

### EURICH TRACES HISTORY

Dr. Eurich traced the history of college admissions policies from the founding of Harvard College in 1636 to the present day. Since World War I, he said, no real progress has been made in predicting success in college. We have improved our techniques, but not our tools. Dr. Eurich suggested that those interested in educational measurement might profit by examining the importance of the individual characteristics we can now identify. He suggested that a study of the progress made by geneticists since the development of the theory of chromosomes might provide a fruitful parallel.

# NEW DIRECTIONS IN TESTING

Alvin C. Eurich

The matter of admission requirements to colleges and universities has gone through four definite periods since the founding of Harvard in 1636.

The first period might be characterized as a period of *laissez faire*, but nonetheless one in which considerable emphasis was given to subject matter. After about 250 years, we moved into a second period of admission requirements, a period of certification based upon a determination of the high schools from which students might be admitted directly. Then followed the third period, the credit counting period.

The appearance of the Board marked the beginning of a fourth period in our admission requirements of college and universities, which we might characterize as the examination period. During this period we have been concerned with two major questions. The first, to which we directed considerable attention, was this: Who should go to college? In this country we have answered that question not by examinations but in another way. We have virtually said that every high school graduate should go on to a college, a junior college or a community college; and so we have really disposed of that question philosophically and in terms of a system which we have built up.

## TECHNIQUES APPRAISED

The second question is one to which we are now devoting attention, because we have disposed of the first one: To which college should the student go, and which curriculum should he follow within the college after he is admitted? Now, that is an exceedingly difficult question to answer in terms of techniques that we have developed up to the present time, but we might

just briefly appraise the techniques now in use.

To begin with we have practically discarded the three bases that have formed the foundation for predicting success in colleges and universities, namely, the subject matter, the certificate, and the credit, and we have moved into the examination period. We have had very extensive studies of examinations and other bases for predicting success, and if we summarize those studies, we conclude that the best single basis for predicting success in college is past performance or high school scholarship. But that criterion presents considerable difficulties because the standards vary considerably from one high school to another throughout the country.

## PERFORMANCE BEST GUIDE

I recall particularly one case that came to my attention when I was at the University of Minnesota: a student who, according to his record, was graduated from high school with high honors. He was the valedictorian of his class. Well, he came to the end of the first quarter at the University and he failed every subject. He was placed on probation at that time. At the end of the second quarter he also failed every subject, so he was dropped from the University with a letter written to his parents. His father and mother came in to see me one day, and they barely arrived at the office when the mother burst into tears and said, "Please take him back, please take him back; it is not his fault at all that he didn't succeed here in college—he was only a four-pound baby."

I tell the story not because of the interpretation the mother gave, but because it illustrates very clearly that we cannot depend upon the grades from high school. It so turned out that this particular boy was a member of the graduating class of three in high school, and his father was president of the school board.

So we run into many difficulties in trying to use the record of past performance as a basis for

---

*This is a condensation of the stenotype report of Dr. Eurich's address at a luncheon after the Board's meeting on October 27th.*



admitting students, but, nevertheless, it is the best single basis that we have.

Now, the second best that we have is a set of achievement examinations. We have found over the years through the work of the College Entrance Examination Board and other agencies and through the work of individual colleges and universities that we can depend a great deal more upon the achievement tests, and so the Board is very wise indeed in placing as much emphasis as it does upon achievement tests.

The third index of probable success in college on which we have done an enormous amount of work is that of the intelligence test or aptitude test, starting particularly with the end of the First World War. Applying the tests that were developed in the Army to our educational situation and refining those over a period of time, we have used aptitude tests very extensively, and still use them today. It is a significant fact, however, that in spite of all the work that we have done refining aptitude tests, their predictive value has not increased perceptibly from the time of the Army Alpha intelligence examinations to the present time. If we interpret it in terms of coefficients of correlation and get the distributions of those relationships over a period of time, we find the averages have been right on dead center, approximately .50 right from the earliest test down to the most refined test of the present day. While we have refined our procedures, we have not increased the predictive value of those tests.

#### PROFILES USEFUL

Now, to be sure, in recent years we have been supplementing the scholastic aptitude test with a variety of other tests of personality factors. We have been concerned with interests, with persistence of effort, and, through biographical information, with various elements that make up the character of the individual. We have brought the results of all these tests together in what we have called profiles, pictures of the individual showing on which tests or which ratings he stands relatively high or low. Profiles have been exceedingly useful for guidance purposes,

but again they haven't increased the predictive value of the measures that we have used. In other words, we still have the same difficulty in predicting whether or not a student will succeed in a given college and in a given curriculum within that college.

So far as the examination period is concerned, we seem still to be on dead center. Perhaps we are a little impatient with progress in this field, impatient because we see around us the tremendous amount of progress that has been made in other sciences, where developments of centuries have been crowded into a few years, but in this particular field we are confronted with the unfortunate and simple fact that during the past twenty-five years the basis for predicting success in college has not improved.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF GENETICS

Clearly we need a new approach of some kind if we are to move into a fifth period of development of college entrance requirements in this country, and perhaps we can take our cue from developments in the field of genetics, for there developments have also gone through various stages.

At about the time the first faculty commission was drawing up the first college entrance examination, geneticists postulated the chromosome theory of inheritance, and concentrated upon the chromosome as the basis for transmitting the inheritance of traits from the parent to the offspring. I wonder if that isn't comparable to the period during which we discovered the intelligence test or the aptitude test. We found a device, an instrument that seemed to be exceedingly valuable in predicting the future success of the student. It was far in advance of anything that we had known before because we were dealing with verbal ability, which was important in any academic situation.

Then the geneticist moved on to a second stage which developed almost simultaneously with the chromosome period. The second stage was based on the theory that inherited traits were handed down from the parent to the offspring through the genes within the chromo-

some. The genes were paired, but there was no assurance, according to the geneticists, that the gene would be transmitted even though it were there. We had a more complex picture in the field of inheritance when the geneticists began talking about the genes. The picture became very complex in terms of the possibilities of inheriting various traits, or the possibilities of crossing various traits, and I wonder if that stage in development doesn't correspond to our profile stage in the field of dealing with college students, where we get a picture of where the student stands in terms of a wide variety of characteristics.

We don't attempt, in this profile stage, to determine the order of importance. We have this picture before us. We know that he stands relatively high on the aptitude test, maybe relatively low in mathematical ability, and so on. In other words, we are confronted with a complex situation which we don't quite know how to interpret from the standpoint of possible future success in college.

The next stage of development of the geneticists in studying problems of inheritance was their discovery that it was not only the genes in the chromosome that were important, but the particular arrangement of genes in the chromosomes that determined whether or not the offspring inherited characteristics of his parents.

I wonder if that does not give us a clue for the further development of the field with which we are all concerned here. If we could find some means of determining the importance of the various characteristics with which we are concerned in the profile, or the order of importance, we would probably have a much better basis for predicting success in a given college. Let me say it more concretely: We all know that, within our respective institutions, students who fall within a relatively wide range of scores on the scholastic aptitude test succeed in college. Now, for some of those students, scholastic aptitude may be exceedingly important. For students at the bottom level of the range, obviously scholastic aptitude isn't as important as some other characteristics.

There is something else that is more impor-

tant than scholastic aptitude for those students. Also in the upper reaches of scores of scholastic aptitude we find students we have admitted who fail in college. Again there is something else that is more important as far as our ability to predict the success or failure of a given student is concerned. Some way or other, by the use of our ingenuity, we need to determine the order of importance of these various characteristics with which we are dealing for a given student. This, then, is our next step.

To take this next step requires all the ingenuity that we can bring together. It requires extensive clinical studies beyond those already made, such as the Grant Study at Harvard, to find clues for ways in which the order of importance of abilities can be assessed. We stand on the threshold of a new period. Whether we will get off dead center through a study of the particular hypothesis suggested here or through some other theory, we are certain that a new approach must be made, if we are to improve the accuracies of our predictions. The possibilities are endless, and they are ours to explore.

## Dr. Fuess Honored; Representatives Elected

Dr. Claude Moore Fuess, Headmaster Emeritus of Phillips Academy, Andover, Custodian of the Board's funds, and for many years a Board mainstay, was elected an honorary representative-at-large at the Board's October meeting.

Five secondary school representatives-at-large, two more than the usual number, were elected: Mr. Frank D. Ashburn, Mr. Francis L. Bacon, Dr. William H. Cornog, Mrs. Harold S. Osborne, and Dr. Morris Meister.

Dr. Lemuel R. Johnston, Mr. Elwood C. Kastner, Mr. E. Kenneth Smiley, and Mr. John M. Stalnaker were elected to the Executive Committee. Dr. James H. Case, Jr., was elected a Custodian.

# How To Register For College Entrance Examinations

The College Entrance Examination Board has set the following schedule for its series of entrance examinations:

January 15, 1949	Saturday
April 9, 1949	Saturday
June 4, 1949	Saturday
August 24, 1949	Wednesday

1. Each candidate should ascertain which particular examination date is preferred by the college (or colleges) of his choice, and which particular tests are required or recommended.
2. Each candidate should obtain an application blank and a copy of the Board's *Bulletin of Information*. These materials are obtainable on request either from the Board's Princeton Office, P. O. Box 592, Princeton, N. J., or the Pacific Coast Office, P. O. Box 775, Berkeley, Calif.
3. The candidate should fill out the application blank in accordance with directions in the *Bulletin of Information*, and mail the completed blank, together with the appropriate fee, to the *proper office* of the Board (see below).

Candidates are urged to request their application forms from the College Board *about two months before the date of the examination*—and two months earlier yet, in the case of applicants in distant countries. It takes time for the request for an application blank to reach the Board; it takes more time for the application blank and the accompanying *Bulletin of Information* to reach the candidate (these printed materials are normally dispatched by third-class mail); and again it takes time for the completed application blank and fee to reach the Board. Moreover, *it is always wise to allow time for any special correspondence that may prove necessary.*

## WHERE TO MAIL APPLICATIONS

1. **PACIFIC COAST OFFICE.** Candidates who wish to take their examinations in any of the regions listed below should mail their completed

applications and fees to the *Pacific Coast Office* of the Board (P. O. Box 775, Berkeley, Calif.):

California	Arizona
Oregon	New Mexico
Washington	Alaska
Idaho	Hawaii
Montana	Australia
Wyoming	All Pacific Islands
Utah	except Japan and
Colorado	Formosa
Nevada	

2. **PRINCETON OFFICE.** Candidates who wish to take their examinations in regions not served by the Pacific Coast Office should mail their completed applications and fees to the *Princeton Office* of the Board (P. O. Box 592, Princeton, N. J.).

In all matters pertaining to tests of the College Entrance Examination Board, candidates **MUST** deal with the appropriate office of the Board.

## CLOSING DATES

1. The *normal closing dates* for the receipt of completed applications and fees in the *proper office of the Board* (see above) are as follows:
  - a. For candidates who wish to be examined in the United States or in Alaska, Hawaii, Canal Zone, Canada, Mexico, or the West Indies: *three weeks* before the date of the examination (*four weeks* for the April series).
  - b. For candidates who wish to be examined *outside* the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Canal Zone, Canada, Mexico, and the West Indies: *seven weeks* before the date of the examination (*eight weeks* for the April series).
2. Applications received after the specified closing dates are subject to a *penalty fee* of \$3.00. The penalty fee must accompany the application.

*No applications received in Berkeley, Calif., or in Princeton, N. J., later than one week before the examination will be accepted.* This is a rule without exception.



